



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,267	12/12/2001	Michael Wayne Brown	AUS920010821US1	1757
7590	05/07/2004		EXAMINER	
Biggers & Ohanian PLLC 5 Scarlet Ridge Austin, TX 78737			ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	
			DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004	

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/015,267	BROWN ET AL.
	Examiner Md S Elahee	Art Unit 2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 and 40-52 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 and 40-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 01/22/04. Claims 1-30 and 40-52 are pending. Claims 31-39 have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 and 40-52 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10-13, 15, 19, 21-24, 26, 50 and 51, the Applicant argues on page 16, lines 16 and 17 that "the intermediary IP of Bartholomew is not an origin device". The examiner disagrees with this argument. Bartholomew does teach that the IP 23 is an origin device of originating the prompt message for the calling party (fig.1; col. 14, lines 9-15). Furthermore, the Applicant does not recite what was originated in the claim; therefore, Bartholomew's IP 23 reads on the claim 1 "detecting, at an origin device" because IP 23 did detect an input speech (i.e., a voice utterance) of an answering party from the subscriber premises (i.e., callee from a destination device). Thus the rejection of the claim in view of Bartholomew remain.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10-13, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 30, 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bartholomew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,119).

Regarding claim 1, Bartholomew teaches detecting, at the IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23), an input speech of an answering party from the subscriber premises (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘an input speech of an answering party from the subscriber premises’ reads on the claim ‘a voice utterance of a callee from a destination device’).

Bartholomew further teaches identifying, at the IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23), an answering party associated with the input speech, such that the answering party identity is generated as identity of the answering party for a telephone call (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.36, lines 18-40, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘answering party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’, ‘input speech’ reads on the claim ‘voice utterance’ and ‘telephone call’ reads on the claim ‘incoming telephone call’).

Regarding claims 2, 13 and 24, Bartholomew teaches instructing the answering party, from the IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23), to provide the input speech (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘instructing’ reads on the claim ‘prompting’, ‘answering party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’ and ‘input speech’ reads on the claim ‘voice utterance’).

Regarding claims 4, 15 and 26, Bartholomew teaches extracting speech information from the input speech (col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘information’ reads on the claim ‘characteristics’ and ‘input speech’ reads on the claim ‘voice utterance’).

Bartholomew further teaches comparing the speech information to stored pattern information for identifying the answering party (col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘information’ reads on the claim ‘characteristics’, ‘stored pattern information’ reads on the claim ‘a plurality of voice samples stored’ and ‘the answering party’ reads on the claim ‘a plurality of callees’).

Regarding claims 8, 19 and 30, Bartholomew teaches enabling the caller to identify a preferred answering party at the IP 23 (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘instructing’ reads on the claim ‘prompting’, ‘answering party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’, ‘IP 23’ reads on the claim ‘origin device’).

Bartholomew further teaches providing an identifier for the preferred answering party to the destination central office switch, wherein destination central office switch is enabled to load subscriber profile information according to the identifier for the preferred answering party (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 3-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘providing’ reads on the claim ‘transferring’, ‘answering party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’, ‘destination central office switch’ reads on the claim ‘destination device’ and ‘load subscriber profile information’ reads on the claim ‘adjust output’).

Regarding claims 10 and 21, Bartholomew teaches that the IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23) is inherently a telephony device (fig.1; col.11, lines 63-67, col.12, lines 1-49, col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 11 and 22, Bartholomew teaches that the answering party identity comprises at least one from among an answering party name, an answering party location, a subject of the call, and a central office identification (col.41, lines 1-67, col.42, lines 1-58,

Art Unit: 2645

col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘answering party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’ and ‘central office’ reads on the claim ‘device’).

Regarding claim 12, Bartholomew teaches an IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23) connected to an intelligent telephone network (fig.1; col.11, lines 63-67, col.12, lines 1-49, col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘intelligent telephone network’ reads on the claim ‘telephone network’).

Bartholomew teaches detecting, at the IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23), an input speech of an answering party from the subscriber premises (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘an input speech of an answering party from the subscriber premises’ reads on the claim ‘a voice utterance of a callee from a destination device’).

Bartholomew further teaches identifying, at the IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23), an answering party associated with the input speech, such that the answering party identity is generated as identity of the answering party for a telephone call (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘answering party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’, ‘input speech’ reads on the claim ‘voice utterance’ and ‘telephone call’ reads on the claim ‘incoming telephone call’).

Regarding claim 23, Bartholomew teaches database (col.37, lines 21-32, col.42, lines 59-67, col.43, lines 1-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘database’ reads on the claim ‘recording medium’).

Bartholomew teaches detecting, at the IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23), an input speech of an answering party from the subscriber premises (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘an input speech of an answering party

from the subscriber premises' reads on the claim 'a voice utterance of a callee from a destination device').

Bartholomew further teaches identifying, at the IP 23 (i.e. 'origin device' includes telephone, central office, IP 23), an answering party associated with the input speech, such that the answering party identity is generated as identity of the answering party for a telephone call (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; 'answering party' reads on the claim 'callee', 'input speech' reads on the claim 'voice utterance' and 'telephone call' reads on the claim 'incoming telephone call').

Regarding claim 50, Bartholomew teaches database (col.37, lines 21-32, col.42, lines 59-67, col.43, lines 1-67, col.44, lines 1-12; 'database' reads on the claim 'recording medium').

Bartholomew teaches detecting an input speech of an answering party from the subscriber premises at the IP 23 (i.e. 'origin device' includes telephone, central office, IP 23) (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; 'an input speech of an answering party from the subscriber premises' reads on the claim 'a voice utterance of a callee from a destination device').

Bartholomew further teaches authenticating an identity an answering party associated with the input speech, such that the answering party identity is generated as identity of the answering party for a telephone call at the IP 23 (i.e. 'origin device' includes telephone, central office, IP 23) (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; 'answering party' reads on the claim 'callee', 'input speech' reads on the claim 'voice utterance' and 'telephone call' reads on the claim 'incoming telephone call').

Art Unit: 2645

Bartholomew further teaches enabling output of the authenticated identity from the IP 23 (i.e. ‘origin device’ includes telephone, central office, IP 23) such that a caller accessing IP 23 is informed of an identity of the answering party (fig.1; col.14, lines 9-52, col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘answering party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’).

Regarding claim 51, Bartholomew teaches comparing the speech information to stored pattern information (col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘speech information’ reads on the claim ‘voice utterance’ and ‘stored pattern information’ reads on the claim ‘with at least one voice imprint stored at said origin device’).

Bartholomew further teaches comparing the speech information to the pattern information, authenticating the identity of the answering party according to an answering party identification stored in association with the pattern information (col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘comparing the speech information to the pattern information’ reads on the claim ‘responsive to matching said voice utterance with said at least one voice imprint’, ‘answering party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’ and ‘pattern information’ reads on the claim ‘voice imprint’).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2645

6. Claims 3, 14 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,119) and in view of McAllister (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,242).

Regarding claims 3, 14 and 25, Bartholomew fails to teach “prompting said callee to enter an additional input to verify said callee identity”. McAllister teaches prompting the called party for one or more repeat attempts (col.34, lines 1-61; ‘called party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’ and ‘for one or more repeat attempts’ reads on the claim ‘enter an additional input to verify said callee identity’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bartholomew to allow prompting the callee to enter an additional input as taught by McAllister. The motivation for the modification is to have the prompt in order to provide more information to verify identification of the called party.

7. Claims 5, 6, 16, 17, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,119) and in view of Timonen et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0058494).

Regarding claims 5, 16 and 27, Bartholomew fails to teach “transmitting said voice utterance to a third party device via a network”. Timonen teaches transmitting the identification data to a third party device via a network (fig.3; page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0056; ‘identification data’ reads on the claim ‘voice utterance’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bartholomew to allow transmitting the voice utterance to a third party device via a network as taught by Timonen. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide authentication of the party.

Bartholomew fails to teach “receiving said callee identity from said third party device”. Timonen teaches receiving the party identity from the third party device (fig.3; page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0056; ‘party identity’ reads on the claim ‘callee identity’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bartholomew to allow receiving said callee identity from the third party device as taught by Timonen. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the identity of the authenticated party.

Regarding claims 6, 17 and 28, Bartholomew fails to teach “requesting a voice sample for said particular callee from a third party device accessible via a network”. Timonen teaches requesting the identification data for the particular party to a third party device via a network (fig.3; page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0056; ‘identification data’ reads on the claim ‘voice sample’ and ‘party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bartholomew to allow requesting a voice sample for the particular callee from a third party device accessible via a network as taught by Timonen. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide authentication of the party.

Bartholomew fails to teach “receiving said voice sample for said particular callee for enabling authenticating of said callee identity”. Timonen teaches receiving the identification data for the particular party for enabling authenticating of the party identity (fig.3; page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0056; ‘identification data’ reads on the claim ‘voice sample’ and ‘party’ reads on the claim ‘callee’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bartholomew to allow receiving the voice sample for the

Art Unit: 2645

particular callee for enabling authenticating of the callee identity as taught by Timonen. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the identity of the authenticated party.

8. Claims 7, 18 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,119) and in view of Silverman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,875,240).

Regarding claims 7 and 18, Bartholomew fails to teach “displaying said callee identity to said caller at said origin device, wherein said caller is enabled to select whether to continue said call according to said callee identity”. Silverman teaches displaying the called party identification information at the end-user device to which the call is routed before the call is answered (col.2, lines 26-55; ‘the end-user device to which the call is routed before the call is answered’ reads on the claim ‘origin device, wherein said caller is enabled to select whether to continue said call according to said callee identity’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bartholomew to allow displaying the callee identity as taught by Silverman. The motivation for the modification is to have the display in order to provide the information of the called party.

Regarding claim 29, Bartholomew fails to teach “controlling output of said callee identity to said caller at said origin device, wherein said caller is enabled to select whether to continue said call according to said callee identity”. Silverman teaches displaying the called party identification information at the end-user device to which the call is routed before the call is answered (col.2, lines 26-55; ‘displaying the called party identification information’ reads on the claim ‘controlling output of said callee identity to said caller’ and ‘the end-user device to which

Art Unit: 2645

the call is routed before the call is answered' reads on the claim 'origin device, wherein said caller is enabled to select whether to continue said call according to said callee identity'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bartholomew to allow displaying the callee identity as taught by Silverman. The motivation for the modification is to have the display in order to provide the information of the called party.

9. Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,119) and in view of Baker (U.S. Patent No. 5,533,109).

Regarding claims 9 and 20, Bartholomew fails to teach "said origin device is a private exchange network". Baker teaches that the calling party device is a PBX unit (fig.1, fig.2; col.2, lines 26-55; 'calling party device' reads on the claim 'origin device' and 'PBX unit' reads on the claim 'private exchange network'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bartholomew to allow the origin device as a private exchange network as taught by Baker. The motivation for the modification is to have the private exchange network in order to provide the multiple users as the calling party.

10. Claims 40, 41, 43-46, 48, 49 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallick (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,359) and in view of well-known prior art.

Regarding claims 40 and 45, Gallick teaches detecting, at a voice identification recognizer of VoIP softphone, a speech (i.e., voice utterance) of an answering called party (i.e., callee) from the called party terminal (i.e., destination device) (fig.1, fig.6; col.3, lines 12-53, col.6, lines 3-14, 27-59, col.7, lines 1-6).

However, It is not clear whether Gallick teaches the “origin device originating a call” that has the speech recognition feature for identifying an answering party of the call. Examiner takes Official Notice that calling party’s VoIP softphone (i.e., origin device) originating a call that has the speech recognition feature for identifying an answering party of the call are well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gallick to allow origin device originating a call that has the speech recognition feature for identifying an answering party of the call in order to provide local voice identification of a called party using the voice recognition function so that the caller does not need to pay extra expense or time to retrieve the identity of the desired called party from his own softphone terminal instead from remote terminal.

Gallick further teaches authenticating an identity of the answering called party (i.e., callee) from the voice utterance at the voice identification recognizer of server (fig.1, fig.6; col.3, lines 12-53, col.6, lines 3-14, 27-59).

Gallick further teaches enabling output of the authenticated identity from the server, such that a caller accessing server is informed of an identity of the answering called party (fig.1, fig.4, fig.6; col.3, lines 44-53, col.5, lines 30-36, col.6, lines 27-59, col.7, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 41 and 46 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 41. Furthermore, Gallick teaches comparing the voice utterance with at least one voice imprint stored at the server (fig.1, fig.6; col.3, lines 12-53, col.6, lines 3-14, 27-59, col.7, lines 1-6).

Gallick further teaches responsive to matching the voice utterance with the at least one voice imprint, authenticating the identity of the callee according to a callee identification stored

in association with the voice imprint (fig.2a, fig.2b; col.3, lines 44-53, col.5, lines 30-36, col.6, lines 27-59, col.7, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 43 and 48, Gallick teaches displayable output to a graphical user interface (col.3, lines 7-12).

Regarding claims 44 and 49, Gallick teaches that output comprises audio alert (i.e., audio output via a speaker) (fig.3, step 310; col.3, lines 6-25).

Regarding claim 52 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 40. Furthermore, Gallick teaches a VoIP softphone (i.e. call initiating telephony apparatus) (fig.1, step 140; col.2, lines 55, 56).

11. Claims 42 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallick (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,359) and in view of well-known prior art and further in view of Bartholomew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,119).

Regarding claims 42 and 47 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 41. Furthermore, Gallick in view of well-known prior art fails to teach “accessing at least one voice imprint from a third party server”. Bartholomew teaches inherently accessing at least one pattern information from the police (col.43, lines 36-67, col.44, lines 1-12; ‘pattern information’ reads on the claim ‘with at least one voice imprint’ and ‘police’ reads on the claim ‘third party server’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gallick in view of well-known prior art to allow accessing at least one voice imprint from a third party server as taught by Bartholomew. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide third party verification service.

Art Unit: 2645

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McKinley, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,377) teach Networked voice-activated dialing and call-completion system.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alam Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE

April 21, 2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

